PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of: Christopher W. Blackburn et al.	Examiner: Jason P. Pinheiro
Serial No.: 10/802,701	Group Art Unit: 3714
Filed: March 17, 2004	Docket: 1842.029US1

For: TIME SERVICE IN A SERVICE-ORIENTED GAMING NETWORK ENVIRONMENT

APPEAL BRIEF UNDER 37 CFR § 41.37

Mail Stop Appeal Brief- Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

The Appeal Brief is presented in support of the Notice of Appeal to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences, filed on November 24, 2008, from the Final Rejection of claims 1-5, 7, 11-20 and 24 of the above-identified application, as set forth in the Final Office Action mailed on August 22, 2008.

The Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 19-0743 in the amount of $540.00 which represents the requisite fee set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 41.20(b)(2). The Appellants respectfully request consideration and reversal of the Examiner's rejections of pending claims.

APPEAL BRIEF UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 41.37

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The real party in interest of the above-captioned patent application is the assignee, WMS GAMING INC.

2. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

The following patent applications are related to the above-identified application, are currently appealed to the Board, and may directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal. No decisions have been rendered by the Board as of the filing of this Appeal Brief.

App. Serial #	Attorney Docket	Title
10/813,653	1842.017US1	EVENT MANAGEMENT SERVICE IN A SERVICE-ORIENTED GAMING NETWORK ENVIRONMENT
11/068,065	1842.018US2	GAMING NETWORK ENVIRONMENT HAVING A LANGUAGE TRANSLATION SERVICE
10/562,411	1842.019US1	GAMING NETWORK ENVIRONMENT PROVIDING A CASHLESS GAMING SERVICE
10/788,903	1842.020US1	A SERVICE-ORIENTED GAMING NETWORK ENVIRONMENT
10/788,661	1842.021US1	GAMING MANAGEMENT SERVICE IN A SERVICE-ORIENTED GAMING NETWORK ENVIRONMENT
10/788,902	1842.022US1	GAME UPDATE SERVICE IN A SERVICE-ORIENTED GAMING NETWORK ENVIRONMENT
10/789,957	1842.023US1	PROGRESSIVE SERVICE IN A SERVICE-ORIENTED GAMING NETWORK ENVIRONMENT
10/794,723	1842.024US1	DISCOVERY SERVICE IN A SERVICE-ORIENTED GAMING NETWORK ENVIRONMENT
10/794,422	1842.025US1	BOOT SERVICE IN A SERVICE-ORIENTED GAMING NETWORK ENVIRONMENT
10/796,562	1842.027US1	AUTHORIZATION SERVICE IN A SERVICE-ORIENTED GAMING NETWORK
10/802,700	1842.028US1	NAME SERVICE IN A SERVICE-ORIENTED GAMING NETWORK ENVIRONMENT
10/802,699	1842.030US1	ACCOUNTING SERVICE IN A SERVICE ORIENTED GAMING NETWORK ENVIRONMENT
10/802,537	1842.031US1	MESSAGE DIRECTOR SERVICE IN A SERVICE-ORIENTED GAMING NETWORK ENVIRONMENT

3. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

The present application was filed on March 17, 2004 with claims 1-24. A non-final Office Action mailed January 3, 2007 rejected claims 1-24. A first Final Office Action mailed July 25, 2007 rejected claims 1-24. An amendment filed October 25, 2007 with a Request for Continuing Examination canceled claims 6, 8-10 and 21-23. A second non-final Office Action mailed February 11, 2008 rejected claims 1-5, 7, 11-20 and 24. A second Final Office Action (hereinafter "the Final Office Action") was mailed August 22, 2008 and rejected claims 1-5, 7, 11-20 and 24. Claims 1-5, 7, 11-20 and 24 stand at least twice rejected, remain pending, and are the subject of the present Appeal.

4. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

No amendments have been made subsequent to the second Final Office Action mailed August 22, 2008.

5. SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

Some aspects of the present inventive subject matter include, but are not limited to, systems and methods that provide a time service in a service-oriented gaming network environment. In general, the independent claims recite systems and methods that provide a three party handshake for providing a authentic and authorized time service on a wagering game network. The time service first sends service information to a discovery agent, the discovery agent authorizes and authenticates the time service and in response publishes the service information for the time service, and a client such as a wagering game machine desiring to use the time service obtains the service information from the discovery agent and uses the service information to contact and utilize the time service.

This summary is presented in compliance with the requirements of Title 37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(v), mandating a "concise explanation of the subject matter defined in each of the independent claims involved in the appeal . . .." Nothing contained in this summary is intended to change the specific language of the claims described, nor is the language of this summary to be construed so as to limit the scope of the claims in any way.

INDEPENDENT CLAIM 1

1. A method for providing a time service in a gaming network including gaming machines, the method comprising:

sending service information for the time service from the time service to a discovery agent on the gaming network, wherein the time service provides a global time reference for one or more of a plurality of clients on the gaming network, the clients including a plurality of gaming machines, wherein in response to a wager at a gaming machine of the plurality of gaming machines the gaming machine depicts indicia representative of a randomly selected outcome of a wagering game; *[see e.g., FIGs. 1-2, element 10; FIG. 3, elements 302, 304 and 306; FIG. 5B elements 501, 502, 503 and 521; page 5, line 10 to page 6, line 16; page 7, lines 9-15; page 11, line 15 to page 12, line 4; page 17, lines 22-28; and page 19, line 14-22]*

determining by the discovery agent if the time service is authentic and authorized; *[see e.g., FIG. 5B, elements 521, 522 and 523; page 7, lines 25-30; page 15, lines 6-23; and page 19, lines 23-26]*

in response to determining that the time service is authentic and authorized, publishing service information to a service repository to make the time service available on the gaming network; *[see e.g., FIG. 5B element 524; page 7, lines 25-30; page 15, lines 6-23; and page 19, lines 27-28]*

receiving by the discovery agent a request for the location of the time service from a client of the plurality of clients; *[see e.g., FIG. 3, elements 302, 306, 312, 326 and 332; FIG. 5B, element 525; page 11, line 21 to page 12, line 4; and page 20, lines 1-2]*

returning the service information for the time service to the client; and *[see e.g., FIG. 3, elements 302, 306, 312, 332, 306 and 326; FIG. 5B elements 526, 527 and 528; page 11, line 21 to page 12, line 4; page 20, lines 3-7]*

processing one or more service requests between the client and the time service, said service requests conforming to an internetworking protocol, wherein the requests include a request for the global time reference using the service information. *[see e.g., FIG. 3, elements 302, 304 and 334; FIG. 4, element 400; FIG. 5B elements 529 and 530; page 12, line 12 – page 13, line 26; page 16, lines 22-29; and page 20, lines 8-11]*

INDEPENDENT CLAIM 15

15. A gaming network system providing a time service, the gaming network system comprising:

a service provider communicably coupled to the gaming network; *[see e.g., FIG. 3, elements 302, 304; page 7, line 16 to page 10, line 28 ;and page 11, lines 15-20]*

at least one gaming machine communicably coupled to the gaming network; *[see e.g., FIGs. 1 and 2, element 10; FIG. 5B element 501; page 5, line 10 to page 6, line 16; and page 7, lines 9-15]*

a time service, said time service communicably coupled to the gaming network and operable to provide a global time reference for one or more of a plurality of clients on the gaming network, the clients including the service provider or the at least one gaming machine; and *[see e.g., FIG. 3, element 304; FIG. 5B, element 502; page 11, lines 15-23; and page 17, lines 22-28]*

a discovery agent communicably coupled to the gaming network, wherein the discovery agent is operable to: *[see e.g., FIG. 3, element 306; FIG. 5B, element 503; and page 11, line 21 to page 12, line 4]*

receive service information from the time service, *[see e.g., FIG. 3, elements 304, 322 and 330; FIG. 5B, element 521; page 11, line 21 to page 12, line 4; and page 19, lines 14-22]*

determine if the time service is authentic and authorized for the gaming network, and *[see e.g., FIG. 5B, elements 521, 522 and 523; page 7, lines 25-30; page 15, lines 6-23; and page 19, lines 23-26]*

publish the service information to a service repository to make the time service available on the gaming network; *[see e.g., FIG. 3 elements 322, 330; FIG. 5B element 524; page 15, lines 6-23; and page 19, lines 27-28]*

wherein a client of the plurality of clients on the gaming network issues a request for the location time service to the discovery agent and uses the service information received from the discovery agent to issue one or more service requests to the time service, said service requests conforming to an internetworking protocol. *[see e.g., FIG. 3, elements 302, 304, 306, 312, 326, 332 and 334; FIG. 4, element 400; FIG. 5B, elements 525, 526, 527, 528, 529 and 530; page 11, line 21 to page 13, line 26; page 16, lines 22-29; and page 20, lines 1-11]*

6. GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

Claims 1-5, 7, 11-20 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gatto et al. (U.S. Patent 6,916,247, hereinafter "Gatto") in view of Abrams, Jr., et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0208638, hereinafter "Abrams") and Hendrickson (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0087367, hereinafter "Hendrickson").

7. ARGUMENT

A) The Applicable Law Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The determination of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is a legal conclusion based on factual evidence. *See Princeton Biochemicals, Inc. v. Beckman Coulter, Inc.*, 411 F.3d 1332, 1336-37 (Fed.Cir. 2005). The legal conclusion that a claim is obvious within § 103(a) depends on at least four underlying factual issues set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co. of Kansas City*, 383 U.S. 1, 17, 86 S.Ct. 684, 15 L.Ed.2d 545 (1966). The underlying factual issues set forth in *Graham* are as follows: (1) the scope and content of the prior art; (2) differences between the prior art and the claims at issue; (3) the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art; and (4) evaluation of any relevant secondary considerations.

The Examiner has the burden under 35 U.S.C. § 103 to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 1074, 5 USPQ2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir.1988). To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested, by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974) ; M.P.E.P. § 2143.03. "All words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that

claim against the prior art." *In re Wilson*, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385, 165 USPQ 494, 496 (CCPA 1970) ; M.P.E.P. § 2143.03. As part of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the Examiner's analysis must show that some objective teaching in the prior art or that knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art would lead an individual to combine the relevant teaching of the references. *Id.* To facilitate review, this analysis should be made explicit. *KSR Int'l v. Teleflex Inc., et al.*, 127 S.Ct. 1727; 167 L.Ed 2d 705; 82 USPQ2d 1385 (2007) (citing *In re Kahn*, 441 F. 3d 977, 988 (Fed. Cir. 2006)).

The Federal Circuit has stated:

> Obviousness is tested by "what the combined teaching of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art." *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 425, 208 USPQ 871, 878 (CCPA 1981)). But it "cannot be established by combining the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention, absent some teaching or suggestion supporting the combination." *ACS Hosp. Sys.*, 732 F.2d at 1577, 221 USPQ at 933. And "teachings of references can be combined *only* if there is some suggestion or incentive to do so." *Id.* (emphasis in original).
>
> *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071; 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir.1988).

The test for obviousness under §103 must take into consideration the invention as a whole; that is, one must consider the particular problem solved by the combination of elements that define the invention. *Interconnect Planning Corp. v. Feil*, 774 F.2d 1132, 1143, 227 USPQ 543, 551 (Fed. Cir.1985). The Examiner must, as one of the inquiries pertinent to any obviousness inquiry under 35 U.S.C. §103, recognize and consider not only the similarities but also the critical differences between the claimed invention and the prior art. *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 834, 15 USPQ2d 1566, 1568 (Fed. Cir. 1990), *reh'g denied*, 1990 U.S. App. LEXIS 19971 (Fed. Cir.1990). The fact that a reference teaches away from a claimed invention is highly probative that the reference would not have rendered the claimed invention obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. *Stranco Inc. v. Atlantes Chemical Systems, Inc.*, 15 USPQ2d 1704, 1713 (Tex. 1990). When the prior art teaches away from combining certain known elements, discovery of a successful means of combining them is more likely to be nonobvious. *KSR Int'l v. Teleflex Inc., et al.*, 127 S.Ct. 1727; 167 L.Ed 2d 705; 82 USPQ2d 1385 (2007).

Further, conclusions of obviousness must be based on facts, not generality. *In re Warner*, 379 F.2d 1011, 1017 (C.C.P.A. 1967); *In re Freed*, 425 F.2d 785, 787 (C.C.P.A. 1970). In fact,

there must be a rational underpinning grounded in evidence to support the legal conclusion of obviousness. The Federal Circuit has stated that, "rejections on obviousness grounds cannot be sustained by mere conclusory statements; instead, there must be some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness." *In re Kahn,* 441 F. 3d 977, 988 (Fed. Cir. 2006), citing *In re Lee*, 61 USPQ2d 1430 (Fed. Cir.2002); 72 FR 57527-28 (Oct. 10, 2007).

Moreover, "mere identification in the prior art of each element is insufficient to defeat the patentability of the combined subject matter as a whole." *In re Kahn,* 441 F. 3d 977, 988 (Fed. Cir. 2006). This was recently echoed by the U.S. Supreme Court in *KSR Int'l v. Teleflex Inc., et al.*, 127 S.Ct. 1727; 167 L.Ed 2d 705; 82 USPQ2d 1385 (2007) (a patent composed of several elements is not proved obvious merely by demonstrating that each of its elements was, independently, known in the prior art.).

In determining the differences between the prior art and the claims, the question under 35 U.S.C. 103 is not whether the differences themselves would have been obvious, but whether the claimed invention as a whole would have been obvious. *Stratoflex, Inc. v. Aeroquip Corp.*, 713 F.2d 1530, 218 USPQ 871 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *Schenck v. Nortron Corp.*, 713 F.2d 782, 218 USPQ 698 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *Interconnect Planning Corp. v. Feil*, 774 F.2d 1132, 1143, 227 USPQ 543, 551 (Fed. Cir. 1985); MPEP § 2141.02. (emphasis added). The Examiner must also recognize and consider not only the similarities but also the critical differences between the claimed invention and the prior art. *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 834, 15 U.S.P.Q.2d (BNA) 1566, 1568 (Fed. Cir. 1990), *reh'g denied*, 1990 U.S. App. LEXIS 19971 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

B) Discussion of the rejection of claims 1-5, 7, 11-20 and 24 as being obvious over in view of Abrams and Hendrickson.

Claims 1-5, 7, 11-20 and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Gatto in view of Abrams and Hendrickson. Appellant respectfully submits that the Final Office Action fails to reach a proper conclusion of obviousness because of the differences between the cited art and Appellant's claims. In particular, Appellant's claims contain elements not found in any of the cited art.

In general, the independent claims recite systems and methods that provide a three party handshake for providing a time service on a wagering game network. The time service first sends service information to a discovery agent, the discovery agent authorizes and authenticates the time service and in response publishes the service information. A client such as a wagering game machine desiring to use the time service obtains the service information from the discovery agent and uses the service information to contact the time service. Appellant respectfully submits that when the claims are considered as a whole, the cited references do not teach or suggest the present invention as claimed in the independent claims.

For example, at least one difference between cited references and the claims at issue may be found in independent claim 1, which recites in part "determining by the discovery agent if the time service is authentic and authorized." Independent claim 15 recites similar language regarding a discovery agent that determines if a time service is authentic and authorized. The Final Office Action asserts that Gatto, at column. 2, lines 59-61; column 8, lines 61-64; column 10, lines 55-63; and column 13, lines 8-22 discloses "determining by the discovery agent if the time service is authentic and authorized." Appellant respectfully disagrees with this interpretation of Gatto for several reasons detailed below. The portions of Gatto cited in the Office Action disclose the following. First, column. 2, lines 59-61 states "[t]he gaming system may further include a Certificate Authority and communications from the plurality of specialized devices to the central server may be authenticated by the Certificate Authority." Appellant notes that the cited portion is referring to authentication of communications between devices and a server. Notably absent from the cited portion is any mention of authorization of any kind. Further, the cited portion states that communications are authenticated, not services. In order to

authenticate communications, the service has to be resident on the network. Appellant's claimed subject matter has the advantage that it determines whether or not a service is authorized and authentic before the service's details are ever published and made available on the network. In other words, the claims recite authentication and authorization of the service itself, not communications. Thus column 2, lines 59-61 of Gatto fails to teach or suggest determining by the discovery agent if the time service is authentic and authorized.

Second, Gatto at column 8, lines 61-64 discloses that a gaming system "may include payment and identification devices, high-level application software modules, network communication means for enabling the gaming machine to exchange data with external devices (such as the central server(s) 112 and the PVU 500, 600, 700)." Again notably absent is any mention of any authentication or authorization of a service. Further, the identification devices mentioned do not deal with authentication of a service, rather they identify a player (see e.g., Gatto at column 5, line 59 to column 6, line 56). Thus column 8, lines 61-64 of Gatto fails to teach or suggest determining by the discovery agent if the time service is authentic and authorized.

Third, Gatto, at column 10, lines 55-63 discloses "[t]he authentication engine 834 may include functionality to consult a Certificate Authority (which may be located on a server on the network 102 or on a computer network connected thereto), certify the authenticity of the identification presented, authorize a given operation, ensure data integrity of data exchanged, securely time-stamp the operation (to ensure non-repudiation of the operation) and/or revoke illegal identifications, for example." The cited section indicates that an authentication engine may be used to authenticate identities (presumably of player identification means) or to authorize operations. Again, there is no disclosure of authentication of a service, and further there is no disclosure of authorization of a service. The items cited above all occur after a service has been instantiated. Thus column 10, lines 55-63 of Gatto fails to teach or suggest determining by the discovery agent if the time service is authentic and authorized.

Fourth, Gatto, at column 13, lines 8-22 states as follows:

> "FIG. 10 shows another configuration of a gaming machine according to another embodiment of the present invention, showing how components once having a clearly defined APIs may be controlled instead by components via a LAN (Local Area Network) and/or a WAN (Wide Area

> Network) 1002 via Remote Procedure Calls "RPCs". A more modem control model is object-oriented, whereby a module may offer network services for consumption by other modules. Widely used standards for such object-oriented models include, for example, Distributed Common Object Module ("DCOM", developed by Microsoft Corporation) and Simple Object Access Protocol "SOAP", a vendor independent protocol based on extensible Markup Language ("XML")."

Again, the cited section fails to make any mention of authentication of authorization of a service, and in fact refers to communications mechanisms and object oriented models with no mention whatsoever of any authentication or authorization of any kind. Therefore column 13, lines 8-22 of Gatto fails to teach or suggest determining by the discovery agent if the time service is authentic and authorized.

Finally, Appellant has reviewed Gatto and can find no teaching or suggestion of determining by a discovery agent if the time service is authentic and authorized in any other portion of Gatto. Further, Appellant has reviewed Abrams and Hendrickson and can find no teaching or suggestion of determining by a discovery agent if the time service is authentic and authorized.

For all of the reasons above, none of Gatto, Abrams or Hendrickson, alone or in combination, discloses determining by a discovery agent if the time service is authentic and authorized. Therefore there are differences between claims 1 and 15 and the cited references. As a result, claims 1 and 15 are not obvious in view of the combination of Gatto, Abrams and Hendrickson. Appellant respectfully requests reversal of the rejection of claims 1 and 15.

Even if the combination of Gatto, Abrams, Hendrickson disclosed the elements of Appellant's claims (which is not admitted), "[a] factfinder should be aware. . . of the distortion caused by hindsight bias and must be cautious of argument reliant upon *ex post* reasoning." *KSR Int'l Co.*at 1397. *See also Graham* at 474. The Examiner cannot use the Appellant's structure as a "template" and simply select elements from the references to reconstruct the claimed invention. *In re Gorman,* 933 F.2d 982, 987, 18 U.S.P.Q.2d (BNA) 1885, 1888 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

Further, as discussed above the combination of Gatto, Abrams and Hendrickson fails to teach or suggest that a discovery service is operable to do the authentication and authorization (with the aid of an authentication and authorization service in some embodiments). Appellant's

claims recite a novel and nonobvious arrangement and application of discovery, authentication and authorization, and the use of a time service in a gaming network, where the time service first sends service information to a discovery agent, the discovery agent authorizes and authenticates the time service and in response publishes the service information, and a client such as a wagering game machine desiring to use the time service obtains the service information from the discovery agent and uses the service information to contact and utilize the service. Thus even if Gatto Abrams and Hendrickson disclose service providers and authentication and authorization (which is not admitted), the arrangement in Gatto, Abrams and Hendrickson is different from that recited in Appellant's claims 1 and 15. As noted above, the "mere identification in the prior art of each element is insufficient to defeat the patentability of the combined subject matter as a whole." In particular, none of Gatto, Abrams and Hendrickson, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests that a discovery agent authenticates and authorizes a time service for a gaming network.

The Office Action further states that "All the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions and the combination would have yielded predictable results to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention." Appellant respectfully disagrees. Appellant notes that the claims recite that a discovery agent authenticates and authorizes a time service. The recited authentication and authorization functions are not found in known discovery agents. Therefore there is in fact a change in the function of the discovery agent recited in claims 1 and 15.

Additionally, Appellant notes that the Federal Circuit has stated: "Virtually all inventions are combinations of old elements. . . . If identification of each claimed element in the prior art were sufficient to negate patentability, very few patents would ever issue. Furthermore, rejecting patents solely by finding prior art corollaries for the claimed elements would permit an examiner to use the claimed invention itself as a blueprint for piecing together elements in the prior art to defeat the patentability of the claimed invention." *Yamanouchi Pharmaceutical Co. v. Danbury Pharmacal Inc.*, 56 U.S.P.Q.2d 1641, 1644 (Fed. Cir. 2000), quoting *In re Rouffet*, 149 F.3d 1350, 1357-1358, 47 U.S.P.Q.2d 1453, 1457 (Fed. Cir. 1998).

Claims 2-5, 7 and 11-14 depend from claim 1 and claims 16-20 and 24 depend from claim 15. These dependent claims inherit the elements of their respective base claims 1 and 15 and are not obvious in view of the combination of Gatto, Abrams and Hendrickson for at least the reasons discussed above regarding their respective base claims 1 and 15.

For all of the above reasons, Appellant respectfully submits that pending claims 1-5, 7, 11-20 and 24 are not obvious in view of Gatto, Abrams and Hendrickson. Appellant respectfully requests reversal of the rejection of claims 1-5, 7, 11-20 and 24.

SUMMARY

For the reasons argued above, claims 1-5, 7, 11-20 and 24 were not properly rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being obvious over Gatto, Abrams and Hendrickson.

It is respectfully submitted that the art cited does not render the claims obvious and that the claims are patentable over the cited art. Reversal of the rejections and allowance of the pending claim are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG & WOESSNER, P.A.
P.O. Box 2938
Minneapolis, MN 55402

Date June 24, 2009 By

Rodney L. Lacy
Reg. No. 41,136

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being filed using the USPTO's electronic filing system EFS-Web, and is addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on this 24 day of June 2009.

Jakaborshy M. Carlon
Name

Signature

8. CLAIMS APPENDIX

1. A method for providing a time service in a gaming network including gaming machines, the method comprising:

sending service information for the time service from the time service to a discovery agent on the gaming network, wherein the time service provides a global time reference for one or more of a plurality of clients on the gaming network, the clients including a plurality of gaming machines, wherein in response to a wager at a gaming machine of the plurality of gaming machines the gaming machine depicts indicia representative of a randomly selected outcome of a wagering game;

determining by the discovery agent if the time service is authentic and authorized;

in response to determining that the time service is authentic and authorized, publishing service information to a service repository to make the time service available on the gaming network;

receiving by the discovery agent a request for the location of the time service from a client of the plurality of clients;

returning the service information for the time service to the client;

and

processing one or more service requests between the client and the time service, said service requests conforming to an internetworking protocol, wherein the requests include a request for the global time reference using the service information.

2. The method of claim 1, wherein the time service comprises a web service.

3. The method of claim 2, wherein the service request is formatted according to a service description language.

4. The method of claim 3, wherein the service description language is a Web Services Description Language (WSDL).

5. The method of claim 2, wherein the time service is registered in a UDDI registry.

7. The method of claim 1, wherein the time service is a local service in the gaming network.

11. The method of claim 1, wherein the client comprises a gaming machine on the gaming network.

12. The method of claim 1, wherein the client comprises a service provider on the gaming network.

13. The method of claim 12, further comprising returning a current time to the service provider.

14. The method of claim 13, further comprising acquiring by the time service a current time from a time server.

15. A gaming network system providing a time service, the gaming network system comprising:

a service provider communicably coupled to the gaming network;

at least one gaming machine communicably coupled to the gaming network;

a time service, said time service communicably coupled to the gaming network and operable to provide a global time reference for one or more of a plurality of clients on the gaming network, the clients including the service provider or the at least one gaming machine; and

a discovery agent communicably coupled to the gaming network, wherein the discovery agent is operable to:

receive service information from the time service,

determine if the time service is authentic and authorized for the gaming network, and

publish the service information to a service repository to make the time service

available on the gaming network;

wherein a client of the plurality of clients on the gaming network issues a request for the location time service to the discovery agent and uses the service information received from the discovery agent to issue one or more service requests to the time service, said service requests conforming to an internetworking protocol.

16. The gaming network system of claim 15, wherein the time service comprises a web service.

17. The gaming network system of claim 16, wherein the service request is formatted according to a service description language.

18. The gaming network system of claim 17, wherein the service description language is a Web Services Description Language (WSDL).

19. The gaming network system of claim 16, wherein the time service is registered in a UDDI registry.

20. The gaming network system of claim 15, wherein the time service is a local service in the gaming network.

24. The gaming network system of claim 20, wherein the time service is registered in a local environment for the time service.

9. EVIDENCE APPENDIX

None.

10. RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX

None.